Serial No.
 10/710,806
 Examiner:
 Carlos Lugo

 Filed:
 08/04/2004
 Group Art Unit:
 3676

Page 10 of 12

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-40 were in the application as filed. Claims 16-27 and 33 were withdrawn, but remained in the application, pursuant to a requirement for restriction. The requirement for restriction identified claims 1-4 and 28-40 as generic. Applicants elected claims 1-15, 19, and 28-40, with traverse.

Claims 6, 7, 9-13, 15 and 42 stand rejected. Claims 2-5 and 28-41 stand allowed. Claim 14 stands objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In this paper, Applicants have canceled claims 6, 7, 9-15, and 42 without prejudice, and submitted new claim 43. Claims 16, 19, and 25 have been amended to change their dependency.

Applicant believes the amendments made herein add no new matter. Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based on prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to be attached thereto.

Reconsideration and reexamination of the application is respectfully requested in view of the

## Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 6, 7, 9-13, 15 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,219,626 to Johnson. The rejection is traversed.

Claims 6, 7, 9-13, 15 and 42 have been cancelled without prejudice. Thus, the rejection is most as to claims 6, 7, 9-13, 15 and 42. Applicants request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6, 7, 9-13, 15 and 42.

 Serial No.
 10/710,806
 Examiner:
 Carlos Lugo

 Filed:
 08/04/2004
 Group Art Unit:
 3676

Page 11 of 12

New claim 43 is claim 14 rewritten in independent form, including the limitations of claims 9, 10, 12, 13, and 42, which the Examiner has indicated would be allowable. Thus, Applicant requests the allowance of claim 43.

## Withdrawn Claims

Claims 16-27 and 33 were previously withdrawn, but remained in the application, pursuant to a species restriction. The Examiner had identified claims 1-4 and 28-40 as generic claims. Applicants elected claims 1-15, 19, and 28-40, with traverse, for examination.

Allowed claim 41 is claim 14 rewritten in independent form, including the limitations of claims 1, 8-10, 12, and 13, all of which were elected for examination. Claim 1 was identified as generic. Thus, claim 41, which is in principal part claim 1, is generic, and allowed.

As the Examiner is undoubtedly aware, MPEP §809.02(c) states:

- (B) When a generic claim is subsequently found to be allowable, and not more than a reasonable number of additional species are claimed, treatment shall be as follows:
- (1) When all claims to each of the additional species are embraced by an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141, applicant must be advised of the allowable generic claim and that claims drawn to the nonelected species are no longer withdrawn since they are fully embraced by the allowed generic claim. (Emphasis added.)

Claims depending from claim 1, now claim 41, which were previously withdrawn pursuant to the species restriction are no longer withdrawn. These include claims 16-27. Because they depend from allowed claim 41, claims 16-27 are allowable. Applicants request withdrawal of the species restriction of claims 16-27, and the allowance of claims 16-27.

Claim 33 depends from claim 28, and was withdrawn pursuant to the species restriction, but remained in the application. Claim 28 was identified as generic and allowed. Thus, claim 33 is no longer withdrawn. Applicants request withdrawal of the species restriction of claim 33, and the allowance of claim 33.

Serial No. 10/710,806 Examiner: Carlos Lugo Filed: 08/04/2004 Group Art Unit: 3676

Page 12 of 12

## **CONCLUSION**

For the above reasons, Applicants believe the grounds for all rejections have been removed. It is respectfully submitted that all of the claims remaining in the application are allowable over the prior art of record. Prompt notification of allowability is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
JERRY CUMMINS ET AL.

Dated: January 12, 2007 By: /Michael F Kelly/

Michael F. Kelly, Reg. No. 50,859 G. Thomas Williams, Reg. No. 42,228 McGarry Bair PC 171 Monroe Avenue, N.W., Suite 600 Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503 (616) 742-3500

G0272587.DOC